CDPAC Meeting Minutes
Thursday, December 6, 2001
State Capitol Building

Welcome and Introductions

Chairperson, *Kathy Malaske-Samu* called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. The anticipated cuts in CalWORKs Stage 3 child care funds appear to have been averted. It is up to us to propose policies to resolve efficiency, equity and "timing out" issues or policies will be imposed on us. Members, staff and attendees introduced themselves.

Announcements

North Valley Catholic Social Services will host welfare reform forums next Thursday in Redding in the morning and in Red Bluff in the afternoon.

The State Child Abduction Task Force will hold a child abduction conference next Wednesday in Redding.

Three-day Inclusion Institutes will be held bringing together teams of child care providers with special education, Regional Centers, and other planners. The first two institutes will be in Pomona, January 14-16, and Berkeley, March 18-20. Call (916) 492-4023 for information.

The Child Care Resource and Referral Network (R & R) will release their new Child Care Portfolio on January 30th. Anyone wishing to be involved with a local rollout should contact their local R & R.

The annual international conference of the Association for Childhood Education International will be held April 3-6 in San Diego. Information is at the website www.acei.org.

The Committee adopted the October and November 2001 minutes as drafted.

Director's Report

Executive Director, *Kay Ryan*, announced that the Governor has directed the Department of Finance (DOF) to authorize the Department of Education (CDE) to release $18.7 million to fund Stage 3 child care through the end of June 2002. This will mean the continuation of child care for 10,000-14,000 children while their parents are working. Ms. Ryan thanked everyone, including the Women's Caucus and advocates, for their efforts in achieving the restoration of these funds. According to the DOF, $400 million will be needed over the next three years for those receiving CalWORKs child care and those who will time out of 2-year post-CalWORKs transitional child care. Of that amount, DOF projects that $200 million will be necessary in Budget Year. The Legislative Women's Caucus is considering proposals but it is not likely that the reforms they propose will save $200 million. The Governor's proposal will be part of the budget and we can expect this issue to be discussed and debated as part of the budget process.

Ms. Ryan outlined the speakers, workshops and events to be presented at the CDPAC conference in February.

The CDPAC budget for 2001-2002 has been reduced by $38,000. Among the resulting changes will be a greater reliance on electronic communications. The meeting packets will have fewer materials and more referrals to websites. Meeting notices will be mailed on a five by eight-inch card. Materials and minutes will be available on the CDPAC website. These changes will result in a substantial savings in money and trees.

CDPAC is working with Jean Tepperman from the Children's Advocate, Children Now and others to invite legislators to visit a child care site in late January or February. We also are co-sponsoring the second annual Working Families Conference in January. It will focus on the issues of CalWORKs and supportive services, child care and nutrition. The goal is to develop recommendations for the legislative agenda. We have also participated in the Facilities Subgroup of the Early Care and Education portion of the K-12 Master Plan. Ms. Ryan has been appointed to be a community representative on the State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and will be a member of the Family Support sub-committee.

Continuing the Discussion: Looking for Answers to the Current Dilemmas in Subsidized Child Care

Debbie MacDonald, President, California Alternative Payment Program Association (CAPPA)

The CAPPA membership includes 75 organizations and represents every county in the state. They do Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 3 child care as well as general fund child care for families that have not been on aid. Ms. MacDonald said CAPPA has presented the Women's Caucus with a list of proposals regarding the Administrative Review. She went over the four proposals that address program efficiencies. They refer to exempt providers, computerized attendance tracking, changing the performance-based contracts that alternative payment programs work under, and streamlining funding terms and conditions.

<u>Reduce the Amount Paid to Exempt Providers</u>: When TANF was introduced, the idea was that parents should have choices when choosing child care, including license-exempt providers. Some centers are license-exempt, but what we really are talking about is family members taking care of family members and/or neighbors. Although the state requires exempt providers to be paid less than licensed providers, an unplanned byproduct of the system is that exempt providers can be paid more. The reason is complicated. Licensed providers can serve subsidized children as well as full-fee children. The rate for subsidized children cannot be more than that for full-fee children. Exempt providers only take subsidized children. They can be paid 90 percent of the ceiling rate for licensed providers. That 90 percent of the ceiling rate can be more than what is paid to licensed providers who are paid basically at market rate. By reducing the amount paid to exempt providers, we feel we would save money as well as serve more families with the money allocated by the state legislature, which was the point of the administrative review. This also is a way to encourage quality care for our children, and quality care is linked to school readiness. Also with this proposal, alternative payment programs could serve more families with the same

amount of money. CAPPA is not proposing that exempt providers be eliminated, only that a more equitable payment system be established.

Q. What rate do you propose paying to exempt providers?
A. The mean market rate or lower.

<u>Point of Sale Attendance Tracking for Alternative Payment Programs (APP)</u>: Ms. MacDonald reviewed this proposal at an earlier Committee meeting. Attendance tracking for alternative payment programs has not been computerized. A pilot is being developed in San Diego County to track attendance via point of sale (swipe card) machines in the larger homes and centers and via home telephones in the smaller ones. With this system, providers can be paid up to the minute instead of the current four to six week delays in payment. It will also enable providers and funding agencies to make more accurate attendance projections.

<u>Review Funding Terms and Conditions for Simplicity and Currency</u>: The discussions required for this proposal would take a lot of time, but would help the APPs run more efficiently. Topics to be reviewed should include the inconsistencies between the various funding sources. Also, the rate structure for the APPs is very complex. For example, there are various part-time rates for different age groups. Standardizing these rates would add to the efficiency of the programs. Further, there is no standard for collection of parent fees. In some places, the APPs collect fees from the parents; in others, the providers collect fees. Collection by providers is much more efficient.

<u>Eliminate the Performance Nature of APP Contracts</u>: APP funding is based on the amount of provider fees paid. Calculating an annual budget is like landing a jet plan on a dime. The APPs are never certain how much funding they will receive during the year, or when they will receive it. Funds may be received too late in the fiscal year to hire staff for the remaining portion of that year. The whole area of contracting with the state can be more efficient.

Q. If our overall goal is to increase the pay for child care providers, what message are we giving the legislature and the public if we support lowering the pay of any child care provider? Also, we should be wary about equating licensed care with quality care. A license may be necessary but not sufficient to ensure quality care.
A. We have an opportunity to increase quality by paying for quality, and in some cases we are not doing that. If an exempt provider improves the quality of their program, then they will be paid at a higher level. A possibility would be to develop a tiered system of payment for exempt, licensed and accredited providers. This also is an opportunity to discuss, on a statewide level, the whole issue of having one level being paid more than another level, which is the current situation.

Q. Ms. Malaske-Samu asked for the Department of Social Services Community Care Licensing Division's (CCL) position on the need to "incentivize" enhancing the quality of care. She noted that it is too bad that these discussions are about comparisons between exempt and licensed care rather than about how to define quality care and "incentivize" it.
A. Bill Jordan responded that there is a measure of quality provided by having the license in place because it guarantees staffing ratios, qualifications, health and safety requirements, and

a process for resolving complaints. But there is no pretense that this is a guarantee of quality care. That would have to be in concert with other measures such as those required by CDE, Title V standards, or whatever other requirements are made of facilities.

Q. How many license exempt children are we serving?
A. The most recent estimates were that approximately 65 percent of Stage 1 children were exempt, Stage 2 was 45 percent, and Stage 3 was either 25 or 35 percent.

Jo Weber noted that PACE is conducting research on why families choose the type of child care that they do. Initial results will be available in a few weeks. Also, there is information in today's packet about the child care choices made by CalWORKS Stages 1, 2, and 3 families and why they make those choices. Factors include work hours, remote living situations, transportation availability, etc. She speculated that families shift from exempt to licensed care as they move through the system because their needs stabilize during that time. That is, they go from attending orientation to having routine work hours.

Q. Does APP pay for overnight care?
A. Yes. Counties and agencies have set their own rates for overnight care. CCL requirements try to accommodate the needs of parents. For example, some work 24-hour shifts and require 24-hour care.

Sujatha Jagadeesh Branch, Senior Staff Attorney, Child Care Law Center

The mission of the Child Care Law Center is to use legal tools to advocate for access to high quality child care for all families who need it, especially those with barriers to receiving child care. The Law Center works with various state and federal offices and agencies to help develop compliance and fraud policies to protect families.

<u>The Overall Principles to be Considered in Developing a Fraud and Compliance Process</u>: The Law Center has been working on the development of a Master Plan for Child Care. In this and the Administrative Review processes, it is essential to consider the real world impact and unintended consequences of proposed policies.

There is no accurate information about the rates of fraud in the child care subsidy setting. Fraud does exist, but most estimates appear to be inflated. Principles to be considered in establishing policies to uncover and deal with this fraud are: (1) Only eligible families should get a child care subsidy. (2) Money spent on compliance, overhead, and administrative costs should be very limited. (3) Rules should be very clear, staff should be aware of them, and they should be applied fairly to everyone. (4) Some of the redundancies should be reduced.

<u>Statutory and Regulatory Guidance</u>: The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and the California Department of Education (CDE) are the primary agencies working on child care subsidy issues in California. Both provide detailed guidance regarding fraud and non-compliance by agencies that administer subsidies and their staff. Based on its history of administering entitlement programs, the CDSS also has extensive regulations regarding fraud and non-compliance by families. The CDE, however, does not have this history, nor does it

appear to have the necessary staff resources to develop standards and guidance. A result seems to be that the field has difficulty understanding the guidance that is provided by CDE with regard to families. We feel it is essential both for CDE to develop clear standards and for it to have the staff to do so. Our specific concern with the fraud and compliance policies recommended by CDE is their suggestion that local child care payment agencies and local child care centers that are subsidized by CDE develop their own policies regarding fraud and non-compliance. We feel it is essential to have statewide standards for all child care subsidy programs. There are serious legal problems with passing that legal authority along to local agencies.

Legal Guidance for Families: We also feel it is necessary to establish legal standards for families as well as child care providers. Some of this has been done, but more needs to be accomplished. Specifically, standards should establish what information families and providers must give to establish family eligibility and the ability of the provider to care for the children, and what form the information must be in. Statutory and regulatory standards need to be developed to establish what is sufficient to raise a suspicion of fraud, when and how investigations should be done, and who should do the investigation. Standards also are needed to establish what information is private, for example, the family living situation or the immigration status of family members. With whom can the information be shared and under what circumstances. If there is a suspicion of fraud, under what circumstances can that information be shared with another office.

License Exempt Child Care: A liability issue of concern is the employment status of a license exempt child care provider, particularly those who care for children in the children's own homes. Although not aware of any reported cases regarding children, Ms. Branch reported that there have been related cases regarding In Home Supportive Services workers who provide disability related services to clients in the clients' own homes. There is a relationship between this issue and the payment rate for license exempt child care. In some counties, the rate is sufficient to pay minimum wage even if there is only one child. In other counties, the payment rate is not sufficient.

The Law Center feels it is essential that parents have the option to choose license exempt care. It is required in federal and state law, and the types of circumstances noted by Ms. Weber require it, as do some circumstances where a child has special needs or the child is an infant or toddler. The Law Center recommends a few minor changes in the law that could reduce some incidents of fraud and increase the health and safety protections and quality of care in license exempt settings. (1) Consider limiting the number of children that can be cared for by a license exempt provider. (2) Some relatives are exempt from the TrustLine registry screening process. Consider eliminating this exemption and require all exempt providers to be screened. (3) Require all exempt child care providers including relatives to have the Health and Safety Self-Certification. (4) Consider clarifying the circumstances in which a provider can be considered exempt. The statutes say a relative or someone caring for the children of one family other than her own can be a license exempt provider, but these terms are not defined. Definitions would be useful and alleviate a lot of concerns.

Redundancy in Fraud and Compliance Policies: We recommend that CDSS and CDE look at this issue and develop trainings, materials, notices of action, and handbooks for parents and providers that, at a minimum, could be used as models at the local level. Having state standards would reduce administrative costs for child care agencies and reduce the risk of errors by these agencies, especially in small or rural settings.

In closing, she said there are several issues that need to be considered in the Administrative Review process. First, the child care subsidy system is under-resourced and we need to be creative about such things as the point of sale devices mentioned earlier this morning, reconciling funding terms and conditions, making program eligibility similar so eligibility determination is not so complicated. Second, available resources must be used to maximize funding for child care rather than for administration. We need clear standards regarding fiscal integrity and eligibility, legal rights, and responsibilities. It is important to have public input, to have legislative hearings, and to have regulations that are developed in compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act. We should not focus on short term savings with long term costs; having state standards for program compliance will have costs at the outset but will save money and ensure the integrity of programs in the long run. The Law Center is eager to support the process of developing these standards.

Virginia Cannon, Parent Voices – Report on reinstatement of subsidized care funding.

At the invitation of Kathy Malaske-Samu, *Virginia Cannon* from Parent Voices reported on the press conference held in the State Capitol on Wednesday, December 5, to discuss the Governor's elimination of $24 million from the State Budget for CalWORKs Stage 3 child care and its effect on families. She reported that after the press conference, parents met with members of the Governor's staff and with Assembly Speaker Hertzberg. Three parents were called back to the Governor's office from their meeting with Speaker Hertzberg where it was announced that the Governor was restoring $18.7 million to Stage 3.

Vice-Chair, *Lynn Lucas*, reconvened the Committee meeting following the lunch break.

Licensed Care – Can the Supply Meet the Needs?

Sarah Mercer, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

Ms. Mercer discussed license exempt care in the context of the state's Latino population. She stated that half of the children in California between the ages of 0-5 are Latino. When we're talking about child care, we're talking about a large number of Latino children.
Parents use license exempt care for a number of reasons: Low wage jobs have non-traditional hours; Licensed care often doesn't meet the family's cultural/linguistic needs.

Research shows that the supply of licensed child care doesn't come close to meeting the demand. Neighborhoods with a high concentration of Latinos have fewer child care spaces in comparison to others. Parents must rely on license exempt care. However, it's not just a supply issue. There are other barriers. Licensed providers may not speak Spanish – Latino parents prefer that their children be exposed to both English and Spanish. Also, Latino parents want a connection to a provider – they don't want to leave their children with strangers. The parent's relationship to the provider is just as important as school readiness in their evaluation. For parents to use licensed child care, it needs to be connected with a church or community organization – something parents trust. When we talk about and try to define quality, we need to include both bilingual and bi-cultural factors.

Desiree French, Policy Analysis for California Education

Ms. French spoke about the results from the "Growing Up in Poverty" study. The study covered three states, including California, and began in 1998. The California women in the study were either entering or re-enrolling in CalWORKs. A large portion of women use kith and kin care. In California, 54% of CalWORKs parents use license-exempt kith and kin care. There's an inverse relationship between supply of center-based care in counties and the use of kith and kin care in Stage 1. In San Bernardino and Riverside counties, there are fewer centers and a higher number of parents who use kith and kin care. In San Francisco County, there are more child care centers, and a comparatively low use of kith and kin care. As children get older, mothers express a preference for center-based care.

Despite the lower use of center care, merely increasing the number of centers won't do away with the need for kith and kin care. In particular, non-traditional hours – which are the working hours of many low wage, entry-level CalWORKs parents – require the use of kith and kin care regardless of the supply of center-based care.

The perception of mothers in the study is that kith and kin care is more trustworthy and "warm and fuzzy." They believe that children feel safer in kith and kin care, and that they receive more individual attention. Observational data regarding quality shows that there is not much difference between kith and kin and center-based care in terms of the warmth of providers. Although mothers perceive kith and kin care to be a certain way, the findings of professional observational data is different.

According to professional standards, the quality of care is higher in center-based care than it is in kith and kin care. The study used the ECERS and FDCRS to determine quality. The research shows that completion of high school by the providers correlates to better child development. Providers' ability to explain and reason with children rated higher in centers. In home based care, providers were more likely to ask children questions. Also, children watched TV more in home-based care.

Shelley Waters Boots, Research Director, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network

The data collected in January 2000 on the supply of licensed child care does not reflect the growth in demand anticipated by the growth in the economy and by welfare reform. Rising salaries took teachers from the child care field into other fields and rising rents made it hard for centers to cover costs. The data reflected a statewide growth in child care slots between 1998 and 2000 of only eight percent, mostly in child care homes. Still, the supply is only about 22 percent of the estimated need. We define the need as the number of children in California with working parents – either with a single head of household or two parents working. There is a wide variability of supply across and within counties. We hope to release our "Child Care Portfolio" report the end of January 2002.

There has been a decrease in the number of centers and homes providing care during non-traditional hours while the numbers of parents that work these hours seems to have grown. This may be a factor in why some parents choose exempt care. There has been a growth in slots for infants. However, only 14 percent of child care centers in California provide at least one infant slot. A recent report examined why California has high costs for quality center-based care. One reason is that California has a "direct contracted" center-based system. This means the funding comes directly from the state and is not based on market forces or parents' ability to pay. We are still trying to define quality care. We know what it is not, but not what it is.

Q. Does the portfolio data include the numbers of children with developmental disabilities in child care?

A. There is a reporting problem when questioning providers about this because they are required to provide reasonable accommodation. In addition, there is no state requirement to report this data and no standardized way for providers to report it, the definitions of disabilities are a factor, and there is no way to determine the numbers by looking at rates paid to providers.

Bill Jordan added that Community Care Licensing data supports the R & R Portfolio data. When they saw a trend in people leaving the field in 1999, they polled former providers to find out why they left. The top two reasons were (1) they were finding employment elsewhere and (2) they had moved and had not yet become licensed at the new address. There is an increase in licensed care since 1999. In California, there are now over 1.1 million licensed child care slots; these represent a growth of about 150,000 in the last four to five years.

What Happens to CalWORKs Families Who Go Off Aid?

Jody McCoy, Policy and Research Analyst, Research Bureau, California State Library

<u>How many families are leaving CalWORKs</u>? From its peak in March 1995 to June 2001, the CalWORKS caseload declined about 44 percent. The largest decline was about 13 percent in 1997-98, slowing to a projected decline in 2001-2002 to about three percent. The national caseload declined about 59 percent from 1994 to 2001.

<u>Why are they leaving</u>? State data show the most common reason in 1999 was families' non-compliance with eligibility reporting procedures (33 %). Only 19 percent left because of increased earnings from employment. Other reasons included receipt of child support, welfare-to-work sanction, and marriage (< 1% each). On the other hand, studies relying on self-reports indicate that 50 to 60 percent say they left due to employment. Thus, many participants counted as non-compliant may actually be working. They may discontinue contact with the welfare office after they become employed, even though they may still be eligible for services. A study in San Mateo, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties showed that 60 percent of those leaving continued to be eligible for CalWORKs services. National researchers show three main factors contributing to caseload decline: (1) the economy, (2) the welfare policies that mandated work, and (3) other policy changes such as the increase in the minimum wage and the expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

How are the families leaving CalWORKs faring? Ms. McCoy shared tables of data developed from a group of national, state and county studies. She noted that racial, ethnic and rural data are limited at this point. About 60 percent of welfare families who work, 60 percent of welfare leavers who work, and 50 percent of low-income families are employed in service and retail trades, where earnings are low. Studies show that families who work experience fewer food and housing hardships than those that do not work.

Between 1996 and 1999, the CalWORKs caseload declined 30 percent. Exits by Caucasians accounted for 44 percent of the decline; African-Americans, 25 percent; and Hispanics, 15 percent. This reflects the national caseload decline. During this same period, Hispanic families have risen from 41 percent to 46 percent of the caseload.

CalWORKs leavers appear to be less disadvantaged than those who remain on welfare. Statewide data indicate that families who leave tend to have an adult head of family with at least a high school education, are less likely to have three or more children in the family, and are less likely to have been on aid for at least three years. Lacking a high school education, having larger families, and having a longer history on aid are factors associated with cycling back on aid.

Employment has increased among families on welfare. About 40 percent of aided adults are working. About 50 to 65 percent of leavers are employed at the time of exit. Forty percent of CalWORKs families have income that is mostly earned income. Monthly earnings among leavers tend to increase over time. Many leavers, however, are not working. The Urban Institute finds that one in seven leavers nationally has no obvious source of income. Sixty percent of leaver families in one California study had incomes below the CalWORKs eligibility threshold.

All CalWORKs families receive MediCal. About 80 percent of leavers have MediCal in the month after exit, and only 50 to 60 percent have MediCal 12 to 18 months after exit. Receipt of food stamps also is lower among leavers. Eighty-eight of welfare families have food stamps, and only about 19 percent receive food stamps after exit.

Twenty-five percent of leavers statewide report problems paying for housing and food. This is similar to hardships reported by current welfare and low-income families. It is hard to estimate rates of substance abuse, domestic violence and depression among these families because people are reluctant to report these problems.

In California, 51 percent of leavers reported being better off overall not on aid, while 30 percent reported they were the same, and 25 percent reported they were worse off. Two-parent families do better off aid than one-parent families; are less likely to return to aid; and report fewer hardships. They are more likely to have MediCal and food stamps than one-parent or child-only families.

CalWORKs leavers are less likely to receive child care subsidies than current welfare families. About 40 percent of CalWORKs families required to participate in welfare to work activities receive child care assistance. Only about 11 percent of leavers receive subsidies. Some studies report that 25 to 30 percent of leavers are not aware that subsidies exist. It is not surprising then that 35 to 50 percent say that child care is a barrier to full-time employment. About 25 percent report out of pocket expenses for care; having to change child care arrangements in the last six months; and leaving a child ages 10 to 14 at home unsupervised.

How many families are returning to aid? Statewide, about seven percent of leavers returned to welfare within seven months. About 20 percent go back within a year. Rates of return are highest in the farm belts and in the north and mountain counties and are lowest in Los Angeles. Rates of return are lower for those who left recently than those who left in earlier years.

Several factors are associated with a greater likelihood of early return to aid. Forty to 50 percent of leavers who return report loss of job or earnings. Other factors are: having less earnings at the time of exit, having less education, having problems with child care, transportation, having three or more children, having younger children, family headed by a younger adult, being African-American or Hispanic, and having problems with substance abuse, domestic violence or depression.

Ms. McCoy said that although many leaver families are employed and earning more, we should be concerned about what may happen during the recession. If families are unable to find employment and have to return to aid, they are unlikely to meet welfare to work requirements. This may become a policy issue.

Mark Woo, Senior Policy Analyst, California Budget Project

Studies are being done to look at what happens with the families that are recorded as leaving CalWORKs due to non-compliance. It is likely that those being reached in these studies are those with a more positive scenario. This may mean we are getting a rosier picture than actually exists because those who cannot afford rent and lost their housing are unlikely to be located and surveyed for these studies.

Jacob Therman, an economist and the lead researcher on the Rand Institute's CalWORKs evaluation, estimates that 50 percent of the decline in the California caseload is due to the economy. He points out that this decline mirrors the decline in unemployment. The recession, officially declared in March, likely will lead to increasing needs for welfare aid, especially among families that do not qualify for unemployment insurance.

Generally, welfare leavers make about $9 an hour. A recent study in Alameda and Contra Costa counties showed that, 12 months after leaving, 28 percent were living below poverty, and another 17 percent were between 100 and 130 percent of poverty. The 130 percent rate is the threshold for ongoing CalWORKs eligibility. About 40 percent of the working leavers cited child care as a major barrier to working full time. Child care also is a barrier to accessing training.

There is a big gap in knowledge among leavers about post-assistance supports, especially child care. Counties are making a more concerted effort to be sure people are informed about these supports when they leave aid.

Michele Rutherford, Program Manager, San Francisco Department of Human Services and

Vice-Chair of the San Francisco Prop 10 Commission

The approach in San Francisco County is that today's working poor are tomorrow's CalWORKs and vice versa. They look at how to support the working poor to prevent them from coming on aid and how to support their clients post-aid. How programs were designed and some elements of post-aid support vary from county to county. Even who is required to participate varies among the county plans. This makes it difficult for researchers to understand what is actually happening.

Clients who are non-English speaking or have limited English are among those having the most problems increasing their earnings. Post-aid supports provided in San Francisco include training programs in language acquisition.

San Francisco is committed to increasing child care resources. They, too, have seen an increased use of licensed care among CalWORKs families.

When families reach Stage 2 in San Francisco, they are off aid. In San Francisco, 93.4 percent of Stage 2 families are working. Six percent report no income or TANF child-only income. Their average family size is three, usually a mother and two children. The average income of Stage 2 families who were timing out from February through June was $1,888 a month, or $22,662 a year. As a comparison, the annual income of an alternative payment family is $18,512. The HUD low-income standard for a family of three in San Francisco is $38,250. The typical rate for child care is $800 a month for a child and over $1,200 a month for an infant in center-based care.

Housing is very expensive. CalWORKs incentive dollars are used to offer a housing subsidy for families leaving aid who are homeless. The cheapest rent their staff found is $1,100 a month for a studio. The market rate for a studio is $1,400. Many working families are homeless and living in cars and in shelters.

San Francisco is also investing in mental health, health consultation, and child care for post-aid support. We have an inclusion project for families with children with special needs. A survey of the school district showed that 18 percent of CalWORKs children have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), which is high.

Jo Weber added that when someone becomes ineligible for CalWORKs due to income the amount of food stamps they qualify for is only about $10 a month, and may not be worth the volume of paperwork. This may be why the rate of post-aid use of food stamps is so low.

Q. Can a CalWORKs client who goes off aid due to employment, then loses their job, come back and train for a different job?
A. Yes, as long as they have not used up their five years of eligibility.

SB 42 – Impacts on Providers Who Transport Children
Sgt. Joe Micheletti and Peggy Howard, California Highway Patrol (CHP)

The new child restraint law will go into effect on January 1, 2002. Vehicle Code (V.C.) Section 27360(a) provides that no parent or legal guardian in a vehicle shall permit his or her child or ward to ride without providing and properly securing them in a child passenger restraint system (that meets federal safety standards) unless the child is either six years of age or older or weighs at least 60 pounds. The old law specifies four years of age and 40 pounds.

V.C. Section 27360.5 requires children between six or over 60 pounds and 16 years to be properly restrained, which means in a child passenger restraint system or in a safety belt. A conviction for violation of these codes puts a point on a person's driving record. The first citation for either code will result in a fine of $100 plus court costs and penalties.

These restraint laws do not apply to buses (defined as vehicles with over 10 seats), which are used to transport persons for compensation or profit or used by a nonprofit organization or group.

The exceptions to these laws are in V.C. Section 27363. One that may cause some confusion allows a child weighing more than 40 pounds to be transported in the back seat wearing only a lap safety belt when the back seat is not equipped with a combination lap and shoulder safety belt. Another exception is, in the case of a life-threatening emergency, or when a child is being transported in an authorized emergency vehicle, if no child restraint system is available, a child may be transported without that system but they must be secured by a safety belt.

There is a statewide campaign to educate officers and the public about the new law and what it means. Those interested in obtaining information about the new law may call the CHP Office at (916) 657-7237 and ask for Sgt. Micheletti or Ms. Howard.

All school buses manufactured after January 1, 2002 will be required to have safety belts.

State Department Reports

Gwen Stephens, Assistant Director, Child Development Division, California Department of Education

Gwen is covering for Michael Jett today. Gwen's unit, the Quality Improvement and Capacity Building unit, focuses on systems improvements for child care programs. They have $100 million in federal funds, and implement the State Quality Improvement Plan. The money funds about 50 different projects, which are managed by seven professional staff. She provided the Committee with a contact list of all projects. These projects address parent education, professional development, early literacy, school readiness, capacity building and program evaluation. The Desired Results program affects all of these. Michael Jett spoke about this project at previous Committee meetings. The first ten Desired Results training sessions will be held in January and February and train 1000 people. Those trained will be the first group to be required to participate in the program as part of their compliance review.

The Pre-K Guidelines are expanding into two projects in addition to the training. The contract to develop the Pre-K Guideline curriculum has gone to Sonoma State University. On Friday, the contractor for the adaptation for family child care homes to the Pre-K Guidelines will be announced.

A management bulletin will be released explaining that an additional $18.7 million is now available for CalWORKs Stage 3 child care through June 2002. The CDE and CDSS are submitting a CalWORKs child care reserve request to obtain additional Stage 2 funds of $32.8 million. This is equal to an estimated hold back from Stage 2 that was allocated to the CalWORKs child care reserve.

Q. What is the status of the state subsidized contracts for the COLA money?
A. The Local Child Care Planning Council contracts will have a COLA adjustment of 3.87. The different programs have different COLA amounts, and they are being calculated and put into the contracts. Contact Mike Fuller at CDE with questions about specific COLA amounts. The contracts are being processed now.

Q. When will applications for state preschool funds be released?
A. Applications will be released in December 2001 and submissions are expected in February.

Jo Weber, Work Services and Demonstrations Project Branch, CDSS

None of the CDSS child care programs were affected by the recent state budget cuts. Three manager positions in her Branch have been affected by the hiring freeze.

The Department will issue an All County Information Notice (ACIN) that will provide information about accessing mental health services for infants and their families. There also will be an ACIN reminding counties that CalWORKs families are eligible for Head Start and encouraging them to collaborate with Head Start agencies.

There will be a CalWORKs Partnerships Conference in Anaheim December 17 through 19.

Bill Jordan, Deputy Director, Community Care Licensing (CCL) Division, CDSS

CCL ise two months into the division reorganization that Mr. Jordan outlined for the Committee in October. All child care related activities in CCL now come under one management structure.

Progress continues on the expected implementation of the Los Angeles Superior Court order implementing the Second District Court directive in the CBS, Inc. lawsuit reported on in earlier meetings. It is likely that the requested information will be provided to the plaintiff in the next month or so.

The mandated report on Department of Health Services regulations as they apply to playground safety has been accepted by the Governor’s Office and is being released. He expects to have copies for the Committee at the next meeting. One anticipated outcome will be the development of playground standards relating to family child care homes.

They will be involved in implementing AB 685 which sets up a requirement, effective January 1, 2002, that family child care homes report serious incidents involving a child.

Cheri Schoenborn, Department of Developmental Services

Ms. Schoenborn thanked Ms. Ryan for her participation on the ICC. It shows the CDPAC commitment to continue to look at issues around children with disabilities.

They are close to finalizing a Memorandum of Understanding with Early Head Start. Ten percent of the children served by Early Head Start and Head Start are required to be children with disabilities. Early Head Start is increasing the funding coming into California.

The Department is continuing many of their training events. One of these addresses the provision of early intervention services in natural environments. It will be in South San Francisco on December 11 and 12. There will be a multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment forum on February 21 in San Diego. It will feature Dr. Stephen Bagnato and Dr. John Neisworth. The Family Resource Centers' annual conference will be in Ontario on February 25 and 26. This will coincide with the announcement of Early Intervention Month in March. Information about trainings is available at www.dds.ca.gov or by contacting West Ed at (916) 492-4000.

The ICC is looking for applications for membership from parents with a child under 12 with a disability or with a child under six with a disability or from providers of early intervention services who also provide child care. Applications are available on the Governor's website and should be sent to DDS. Contact Ms. Schoenborn for information or applications.

The Capitol tree lighting ceremony will be held on Tuesday, December 11. This will be the 19th year a child with a disability has assisted the Governor and his wife in lighting the tree.

Ms. Lucas thanked everyone for their attention and wished everyone a happy holiday. Ms. Ryan reminded everyone that the January meeting will be a retreat held at the Sierra Health Foundation. Meeting notices will be mailed out.

ATTENDEES AT DECEMBER 6, 2001 CDPAC MEETING

Committee Members:

Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Chairperson
Marie Kanne Poulsen, USC Children's Hospital
Gwen Stephens, Department of Education
Eleanor Moulton, EduCare
Dianne Philibosian, Pubic Member
Cheri Schoenborn, Dept. of Developmental Services
Robert Bates, Department of Health Services
Bonnie Parks, Employment Development Department
Joyce De Witt, Public Member
Joyce Hanson, Grandparent/Child Advocate
Lynn Lucas, El Dorado County Supt. of Schools
Earl Peterson, Child Care Consultant
Jo Weber, CA Dept. of Social Services
Bill Jordan, CA Dept. of Social Services
Amy Tan, Sacramento City College USD

Participants:

Barbara Coulibaly
Steve Erwin, KAPLAN
Mei Kwong, Children's Home Society of CA
Linda Parfitt, CDD, CDE
Pamm Shaw, CEITAN
Charlene Tressler, CAPPA and
San Diego Child Care Planning Council
Pam Grigsby, CDSS
Kim Johnson, Children's Network of Solano Council
Michele Rutherford, San Francisco DHHS
Peggy Traverso, EISS
Jean Skinner, Siskiyou Co. LPC
Melinda Waring, Yolo Co. LPC
Diane Harkins, UC Davis
Dolores Meade, CCDAA
Alecia Sanchez, Assembly Member Strom-Martin
Lizelda Lopez, Assembly Member Diaz
Jody Mc Coy, California Research Bureau
Mary Rich, Clovis Unified School District
Sherry Paul, San Diego County HHS
Alex Cooke, On the Capitol Doorstep
Sarah Mercer, MALDEF
Ellen Moratti, TRG
Mardi Evans, CAPPA
Dora Cook, DSS San Bernardino County
Beth McGovern, CA NOW
Mark Woo, California Budget Project
Sujatha Branch, CCLC
Dee Cuney, Family Child Care
Linda Inglett, Community Care Licensing
Kathi Linquist, Contra Costa Co. LPC
April Befumo, Stanislaus Co. LPC
Donita Stromgren, CCR&R Network
Kathy Walker, El Dorado, LPC
Tina Persaud, Young World of Learning
Tina Williams, Central California CARES
Beth Main, TEACH, Inc.
Sheila Ecksten, Inter-Tribal Council
Vera Nichols, California State Library
Robbie Townsley, City of Davis R&R
Gloria Balch, Valley Oak Children's Services
Pam Sorlagas, LA Child Care & Dev. Council
Jean Miner, Children's Services International
Mark Carlson, Lutheran Office of Public Policy
Virginia Cannon, Child Action
Roni O'Connell, Children's Services International
Desiree French, PACE
Diana Short, Community Resources for Children
Joe Micheletti, CHP
Peggy Howard, CHP
Lisa Severino
Natalie Baughman
Johnna Kilby
Laura Escobedo
Katie Sanchez
Debbie MacDonald, CAPPA

Staff:

Kay Ryan, Executive Director
Sharron Goldstein, Analyst
Sharon Rea Zone, Analyst
Leslie Witten-Rood, Analyst
Priscilla Jong